



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2025

by E Fawcett BA (Jt Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3370617

149 Idle Road, Bradford BD2 4NB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Nadia Mehnaz against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/1750/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension at 149 Idle Road, Bradford, BD2 4NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/1750/HOU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan (unreferenced); 149-Arch.25.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling constructed of stone and render under a hipped slate roof. It is set back from the highway and has a small garden and driveway to the front. I saw during my site visit that a single storey side extension and front porch are currently under construction and appear to be substantially complete.
4. The appeal property is located within a row of semi-detached dwellings of a similar design and construction, although there is a mix of age and style of property in the wider area, including on the opposite side of Idle Road. Within the same row of properties as the appeal site, numerous dwellings have two-storey side extensions. However, the general rhythm and original form of the dwellings is maintained due to

the set back and lower ridge level of these extensions.

5. The proposed development would extend up to the front wall of the dwelling at ground floor but would be set back at first floor with the ridge height also set lower than the highest part of the existing roof. This would break up the two-storey element, making it appear subservient to the original dwelling. This would be a similar arrangement to some of the other extensions close to the site.
6. The council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) contains specific guidance in respect of extensions to the side of dwellings. It recommends that a 1 metre set back from the main front elevation is achieved to ensure that extensions appear subservient to the original dwelling, and that a 1 metre gap is maintained between the side wall of an extension and the boundary.
7. Whilst there is some conflict with the general design principles set out within the SPD, given the modest width of the extension, its set back at first floor and its lower hipped roof, it would not overly dominate or unbalance the existing pair of semi-detached dwellings. The proposal would extend very close to the side boundary of the property, leaving little perceivable gap. However, the hipped design of the roof would avoid a terracing effect, and the set back at first floor would maintain a sense of subservience. The presence of similar extensions in the immediate area would mean that the proposal would not look out of place in this context. It would therefore maintain the overall character and quality of the surrounding street scene. The proposal would therefore comply with the aims and objectives of policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for Bradford District, Core Strategy (2017), which seek to ensure that proposals achieve good design and are appropriate to their context.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out following the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. A condition is also necessary requiring materials to match the existing dwelling to integrate the appearance of the proposed extension with that of the original building and to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

E Fawcett

INSPECTOR